APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/974,594	10/09/2001	Norman Ken Ouchi		7077

41212   7590   09/03/2008

NORMAN KEN OUCHI
P.O. BOX 20111
SAN JOSE, CA 95160

EXAMINER
DALENCOURT, YVES

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2157	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/03/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 July 2008*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *21-40* is/are pending in the application.
        4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *21-40* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
        Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
        Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
        a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
          1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
          2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
          3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
        * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
        Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
        Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed

on 07/07/2008.

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of the term " the

invention/present invention" (page 20, lines 1, 3, 9, and 13). It is suggested to start the

abstract with ---- A workflow systems to support ----; and delete such term in the

abstract.

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the
disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single
paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that
the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract
on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology
often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The
abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether
there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information
given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The
disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure
describes," etc.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, the limitation of " executing the route in a workflow system ------- by the route step " (lines 22 – 25) is confusing. It is not clear to which " route " is being executed since there is one for the attachment of a file and another one for the download of a file. Also, "in response to a route step " (claim 1, line 23) is not understood. Is Applicant referring to a different route step or the previous one mentioned above?

In claim 1, line 28, it is not clear to where exactly " the second file" is being attached.

Response to Amendment

The Examiner has acknowledged Applicant's response.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 05/16/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding Applicant's argument (page 2, first paragraph) that Ghoneimy does not teach the classification of files to be attached or downloaded nor teach a workflow step to attach a file or a specified classification or a workflow step to download a file of a specified classification. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's assertion because Ghoneimy discloses that the workflow system has node types and each node

has its own attribute or classification of processes. The user of the workflow can access

the attributes of a process and the activity performed on that process is attached as a

file type. Ghoneimy further discloses that the activity node can be assigned one or more

forms to allow user access to the attributes of the containing process (see paragraph

[0072]).

Applicant argues that (second paragraph) that Ghoneimy does not teach

classification of a file for attachment or download by users during the execution of a

workflow route. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's argument because

Ghoneimy discloses that the workflow manager package contains bean to establish a

connection to the Server and retrieve references to server-side objects. Client bean

APIs can be used to perform such common tasks as: logging in to the workflow server;

retrieving a work item, process, or process definition (templates); managing the

Document Management System; and determining role membership (see paragraph

[0204]).

Applicant also argues that the files in Ghoneimy are not accessible to the

workflow user. The Examiners wants to point out to the Applicant that Ghoneimy

discloses a folder hierarchy which is a tree of folders (**claimed classification of

files**).The tree of folders include personal folder sub-trees and shared folder sub-trees.

The folder for assigned tasks can be active or completed. The owned processes can be

active or completed. Others allow the user to create a personal folder hierarchy where

short cuts to processes, plans, and activities can be created (see paragraph [0208]).

Claims 21 - 40 are rejected with art as best understood by the Examiner.

The Examiner kindly requests the Applicant to amend the claims in order to make

them clearer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 21 – 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Ghoneimy et al (US Patent Publication No. 2004/0078373; hereinafter Ghoneimy) in

view of Van Huben et al (US 5,920,873; hereinafter Van Huben).

Ghoneimy teaches the invention as claimed including a workflow distributing

apparatus and method (see abstract)

As per claims 21, 28 and 36, Ghoneimy teaches a method for the controlled

processing of classified file types wherein a first file of a first classified file type is

processed into a second file of a second classified file type by a plurality of users with

access to a route directed workflow system in a computer network comprising the steps

of:

defining a set of classified file types including a first classified file type and a

second classified file type (classification of file; pp 0055-0065);

dividing the process into a first classified file type attachment step, a first

classified file type download step, a step that processes a first classified file type into a

second classified file type, a second classified file type attachment step, and a second

classified file type download step (processes and attachments; 0079-0082);

defining route steps that specify attachment or download of a file of a specified

classified file type (pp 0085);

producing a route with a route step that specifies attachment of a first file with the

first classified file type by a first user, followed by a route step that specifies the

download of the first file with the first classified file type by a second user, followed by a

route step that specifies the attachment of a second file with a second classified file type

by the second user, followed by a route step that specifies the download of the second

file with the second classified file type by a third user (pp 0085-0089);

defining a first file of the first classified file type (pp 0065);

executing the route in a workflow system directed by the route where the

workflow system in response to a route step presents to the user a screen to attach or

download a file of the classified file type as specified by the route step (paragraphs

[0111] and [0116]).

Ghoneimy teaches substantially all the limitations, except for having the first user

attaches the first file of the first classified file type; the second user downloads the first

file, processes the first file into a second file of the second classified file type, and

attaches the second file; and the third user downloads the second file of the second

classified file type.

However, Van Huben teaches an analogous data management control system for file and database which shows the idea of presenting a screen, where the first user attaches the first file of the first classified file type; the second user downloads the first file, processes the first file into a second file of the second classified file type, and attaches the second file; and the third user downloads the second file of the second classified file type (col. 4, lines 10 – 67; col. 18, line 62 through col. 19, line 67; Van Huben discloses that the DCS has a built-in Bill of Materials (BoM) Tracker to facilitate tracking many design components in large projects. The main objective of the BoM Tracker is to group certain design components to make it easier to promote them through the library and track their synchronization. This is crucial for data sets that contain some source and some derived files from that source. The following features exist in the BoMTracker).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Ghoneimy by incorporating the idea of having the first user attaches the first file of the first classified file type; the second user downloads the first file, processes the first file into a second file of the second classified file type, and attaches the second file; and the third user downloads the second file of the second classified file type as evidenced by Van Huben for the purpose of increasing data integrity, thereby reducing the risk of data getting out of sync.

As per claims 22 and 29, Ghoneimy and Van Huben teach all the limitations in claims 21 and 28, and Ghoneimy further teaches, wherein a third file has a parent-child

relationship with a fourth file and the file attachment attaches the third and fourth files

with a parent-child relationship (pp 0065-0071).

As per claims 23, 31 and 40, Ghoneimy and Van Huben teach all the limitations

in claims 21, 28, and 36, and Ghoneimy further teaches, wherein a third file can have

the same file name as a fourth file and the files are distinguishable (pp 0055-0071).

As per claims 24 and 32, Ghoneimy and Van Huben teach all the limitations in

claims 21 and 28, and Van Huben further teaches, wherein the route has a loop and the

files in each iteration of the loop are distinguishable (col. 43, lines 31 – 61; col. 115,

lines 8 – 18; col. 117, lines 5 - 12; Van Huben teaches that the File Loop in Step 22412

is repeated until all files are exhausted. Upon exit from the loop control proceeds to

Step 22419, List Files. Here, the file information is re-written with the source and

destination physical locations in preparation for the upcoming file transfer. The file name

of this control file indicates whether the file transfer pertains to a Put or Promote).

As per claims 25, 33, 34 and 39, Ghoneimy and Van Huben teach all the

limitations in claims 21, 28, and 36, wherein the route provides a conditional branch

capability at a route step and the user at the route step indicates the branch choice for

the next route step, (pp 0091-0111).

As per claims 26 and 35, Ghoneimy and Van Huben teach all the limitations in

claims 21 and 28, wherein the screen at a route step provides a means to download a

file based on the file classification (pp 0065-0079).

As per claims 27, 30, 37 and 38, Ghoneimy and Van Huben teach all the

limitations in claims 21, 28, and 36, wherein a seventh file is related to an eighth file in a

parent-child relationship and the file download downloads the seventh and eighth files in

a parent-child relationship (pp 0065-0071).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Bly et al (US 5,220,657) discloses updating local copy of shared data in a

collaborative system.

Maki et al (US 5,201,047) discloses attribute-based classification and retrieval

system.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Yves Dalencourt whose telephone number is (571) 272-

3998. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 7:30AM - 6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272 4001. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

August 30, 2008

/Yves Dalencourt/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2157